ACIS - 1081/85 19 February 1985

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Intelligence

Director, Office of Legislative Liaison

FROM:

Chief, Arms Control Intelligence Staff

SUBJECT:

Senate Arms Control Observers Group (U)

- 1. This memorandum is for your information. (U)
- I participated this morning in a session with the Senate Arms Control Observers Group. Commissioner Richard Ellis (former SAC Commander) participated with me. The session consisted of two parts:
  - -- An intelligence briefing, lasting about thirty minutes, in which I presented the intelligence on major compliance questions, as well as an overview of Soviet thoughts on arms control compliance. (This latter point is based on the SOVA typescript memorandum.).
  - -- A discussion by Commissioner Ellis about the activities of the Standing Consultative Commission (SCC) in Geneva. The Commission meets twice a year and is the one formal arena where the US and USSR can discuss ambiguous situations, including violations.

The Senators in attendance were: Stevens, Nunn, Byrd, Kennedy, Warner, Nichols, Gore, and Pell. Three staff officers were in attendance: Punaro, Ashworth, and Bell. The intelligence portions of both presentations was straightforward, using the material which is the basis for the President's report to the Congress on compliance.

During Commissioner Ellis' session, a number of Senators asked me what they clearly knew to be policy questions. In most cases, I answered the intelligence portion of their question. With respect to the policy questions, I expressed a view part of the time and when I did so, I made it clear that it was my personal opinion, as opposed to a view of the Intelligence Community or the DCI. Senator Nunn particularly said he was thankful for my candor and clearly indicated that he understood the differences between my intelligence

SECRET/NOFORN

25X1 DCI EXEC REG

Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2010/08/05: CIA-RDP87M00539R001001410035-4

25X1

25X1

25X1

briefing and my personal views. One of the personal views I gave of a policy nature, for example, was that the SCC arguably was a good idea for the US because:

- -- It gave us an opportunity to get from the Soviets their official view about compliance questions.
- -- The SCC also gave the US the opportunity to tell the Soviets officially the US Government's view about compliance questions; I said that there is no other mechanism in existence which allows the US to do so in as non-political way as possible. (S/NF)

and [	4. let	If there me know.	is anything (U)	more	I	can	do	to	assišt	you	here,	please	ca11

25X1

ACIS - 1081/85 19 February 1985

SUBJECT: Senate Arms Control Observers Group (U)

## DISTRIBUTION:

25X1

25X1

DDI/ACIS: 19Feb85

25X1

3